



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/959,160	10/28/1997	ALBERT S. BALDWIN	5470-148	4280

7590 05/20/2003

MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC
POST OFFICE BOX 37428
RALEIGH, NC 27627

EXAMINER

MCKELVEY, TERRY ALAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1636

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2003

34

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	08/959,160	BALDWIN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Terry A. McKelvey	1636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/4/02, 2/13/03.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3,6-8,14-16 and 29-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3,6-8,14-16 and 29-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>27, 31</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/4/02 has been entered.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of species doxorubicin in Paper No. 33, filed 2/13/03 is acknowledged.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 14-16, and 29-31 are objected to because of the following informalities: the use of improper punctuation. Claim 1, etc use a semicolon to separate phrases. Because the phrases modify the earlier part of the claims, the proper punctuation is the comma, not the semicolon. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, there is no clear positive antecedent basis for "such therapy".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a),

Art Unit: 1636

the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 14-16, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,780,454) in view of Gjerset (U.S. Patent No. 6,054,467).

Adams et al teach the administration of proteasome inhibitors for treating specific conditions in animals that are mediated or exacerbated, directly or indirectly, by proteasome function, such as cell proliferative diseases such as cancer (column 6). This reference specifically teaches reducing the activity of NF-kB in an animal (such as a mammal) comprising contacting the cells of the animal with a proteasome inhibitor (column 20), and reducing the rate of degradation of p53 protein in an animal (preferably, an animal subjected to DNA damaging drugs or radiation) comprising administering to said animal a

Art Unit: 1636

proteasome inhibitor (column 21). Adams et al teach that: "The use of proteasome inhibitors provides a method for augmenting the expression of p53 in normal cells by preventing its degradation by the proteasome. An example of this would be the systemic administration of proteasome inhibitor at a sufficient dose to inhibit p53 degradation by the proteasome during the treatment of the tumor with cytotoxic drugs or radiation. This will prolong and increase the levels of p53 expression in normal cells and will enhance the arrest of normal cell proliferation, reducing their sensitivity to higher doses of radiation or cytotoxic drugs. . . Thus, proteasome inhibitors can be used as adjuvants to therapy with tumericidal agents, such as radiation and cytotoxic drugs." (column 24). This reference also teaches that compounds of the present invention (proteasome inhibitors) inhibit the growth of cancer cells and that they can be administered to treat any cancer, including specific cancers (which encompass breast cancer) (columns 27-28).

Adams et al do not specifically teach administration of an anthracycline antibiotic such as doxorubicin as the cytotoxic drug to be administered with a proteasome inhibitor.

Gjerset teaches a method for the induction of p53-mediated apoptosis in a cell comprising the step of contacting the cell with at least one inhibitory agent that inhibits DNA repair.

Art Unit: 1636

This method may further comprise contacting the cell with a first stimulatory agent that increases the level of a tumor suppressor in said cell, and that the tumor suppressor may be p53 (column 2). This reference also teaches that the method may also comprise the step of providing a DNA-damaging agent, that suitable DNA-damaging agents include daunorubicin and doxorubicin, and that tumor cells that are contemplated targets include breast tumor cell (columns 2-3). It is taught that delivery of the inhibitory agent, the stimulatory agent and/or the DNA damaging agent is advantageously via direct intratumoral injection, and in a more specific embodiment, the injection comprises continuous perfusion of the tumor (column 3) (which reads on simultaneous administration of the agents.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cancer treatment method by proteasome inhibitor/cytotoxic drug administration taught by Adams et al by using as the cytotoxic drug doxorubicin as taught by Gjerset because Adams et al teach that it is within the ordinary skill in the art to administer a proteasome inhibitor (which augments p53 expression by preventing degradation of p53) with a cytotoxic drug to treat cancer, including cancers encompassing breast cancer, and Gjerset teaches that it is within the ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 1636

to treat cancer, such as breast cancer, by contacting animals with a composition comprising an inhibitory agent that inhibits DNA repair, and a first stimulatory agent that increases the level of p53 in said cell, and that the method may also comprise providing a DNA-damaging agent such as daunorubicin and doxorubicin in the composition.

One would have been motivated to do so for the expected benefit of using a known cancer-treating cytotoxic drug, doxorubicin, in the proteasome inhibitor/cytotoxic drug cancer treatment taught by Adams et al, which particular drug is known to be useful for treating cancer when coadministered with an agent that augments p53 expression as taught by Gjerset. Selection of a known material based upon its suitability for the intended use is obvious. Based upon the teachings of the cited references, the high skill of one of ordinary skill in the art, and absent evidence to the contrary, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success to result in the claimed invention.

Regarding the different preambles of the claimed invention, such as "A method of enhancing the cytotoxic effects of an antineoplastic chemotherapeutic agent . . .", "A method of enhancing chemotherapeutic cytotoxicity in a mammalian subject . . .", "A method of treating a tumor in a mammalian subject . . .",

Art Unit: 1636

"A method of treating a mammalian subject receiving a chemotherapeutic agent . . .", and "A method of increasing the cytotoxicity of a chemotherapeutic agent . . .", the preambles indicate the intended use of the claimed method which is defined by the method steps. Although the combination of the cited references may result in a method which does not have precisely the same intended use, the resulting method is the same because it comprises the same method steps (administering a proteasome inhibitor and doxorubicin to mammals suffering from cancer). Intended use limitations hold little patentable weight where the method steps can stand alone. Also, performing the method steps made obvious from the combined teachings of the recited references would inherently result in what is claimed in the preambles, such as increasing cytotoxicity of the chemotherapeutic agent.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Certain papers related to this application may be submitted to Art Unit 1636 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d)). The official fax telephone numbers for the Group are (703) 308-4242 and (703) 305-3014.


Art Unit: 1636

NOTE: If Applicant does submit a paper by fax, the original signed copy should be retained by applicant or applicant's representative. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office.

Any inquiry concerning rejections or other major issues in this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Terry A. McKelvey whose telephone number is (703) 305-7213. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, except for Wednesdays, from about 7:30 AM to about 6:00 PM. A phone message left at this number will be responded to as soon as possible (i.e., shortly after the examiner returns to his office).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Remy Yucel can be reached on (703) 305-1998.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.



Terry A. McKelvey, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1636

May 19, 2003